

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 6-17 and 19 are currently pending. Claims 6, 10, 14 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found on pages 7-8 of the specification.

Applicant is submitting a replacement sheet for FIG. 2 to resolve duplicate drawing reference numbers in conjunction with replacement paragraphs for the specification.

Interview Summary

A telephone interview was conducted on December 12 between Applicant's representative, Arno Naeckel, and Examiner El Chanti. During the interview it was discussed that the Leonard reference does not describe coding the message body while the message was being composed in a messaging application, before clicking the send command and before being sent from the application and not after the message has been created and sent by the messaging application. The Examiner said he would reconsider based on written amendments and arguments.

102 Rejections

Claims 6-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Leonard et al (US Pat 6,721,784). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Amended independent claims 6, 10, 14 and 19 recite similar elements that are not disclosed by Leonard.

Amended independent claim 6 recites, in pertinent part:

“[a] method for detecting and selectively preventing the forwarding of an electronic message after receipt by the recipient, wherein the electronic message has a unique message identifier, the method comprising *coding the body of the electronic message in response to a user request while the electronic message is being composed in*

a messaging application, before the user clicks the send command and before being sent from the messaging application to indicate a request to prevent forwarding...and notifying the user, by the gateway, of an attempt to forward.”

Support for the amendment can be found in Fig. 3 and paragraphs 24-26 of the specification.

These above recitations are contrary to Leonard. Leonard describes that the coding of the message is done by opening an applet after the message is created and sent by the message originator's mail program (i.e. after clicking the send button) (Col. 12, l. 33-50; Col. 19, 53-63; Col. 20, l. 17-20) and that the coding is done in the message header (Col. 16, l. 12-20; Col. 19, l. 5-10 and l. 30-35, Col. 22, l. 33-41). Leonard is not describing coding the body of the electronic message in response to a user request while the electronic message is being composed in a messaging application, before the user clicks the send command and before being sent from the messaging application to indicate a request to prevent forwarding.

In addition, Leonard appears not to describe “notifying the user, by the gateway, of an attempt to forward”. Leonard describes that forwarding information is recorded (Col. 22, l. 50-63) but fails to describe that the user is notified of a forwarding attempt. Therefore Leonard fails to describe this element as well.

Because Leonard fails to describe the above subject matter, Leonard fails to describe all of the claim recitations and therefore amended independent claim 6 is allowable over Leonard for at least these reasons. Amended independent claims 10, 14 and 19 recite similar subject matter and are allowable over Leonard for at least the same reasons.

Further, amended independent claim 19 recites “the user input is a dot command”. Leonard fails to describe the use of dot commands by the user. As such, amended independent claim 19 is allowable over Leonard for at least this additional reason.

Dependent claims 7-9, 11-13 and 15-17 depend from one of an allowable amended independent claim 6, 10 and 14, respectively. Therefore, dependent claims 7-9, 11-13 and 15-17 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant asserts that the application including claims 6-17 and 19 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

This response is being filed with a fee for a one month extension of time. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2007

/Arno Naeckel/
Arno Naeckel
Reg. No. 56,114

Withers & Keys, LLC
615 Colonial Park Drive
Suite 103
Roswell, Ga 30075
(404) 849.2093